

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the communication filed on 09/15/2009.
2. Claims 1-37 are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but found unpersuasive.
4. **35 USC 112**, first paragraph rejection of claim 5. The rejection is maintained as the claim fails to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claim discloses "the first remote system to generate a response and the first remote system to have its response received by the client". The examiner cannot find any disclosure in the specification regarding "the first remote system to generate a response" in the specification. Clearly a first remote system to generate a response can be different from a first remote system to have its response received by the client, implied in the claimed language and as known in the art due to inherent network delays of transferring the response to the client. There is no assigning task based on a first remote system to generate a response in the original disclosure. In response to applicant's cited section starting on p. 18, l. 14, claiming support to the claimed invention. The examiner disagrees. This section describes a remote system having a track record of completing compilation task(s) quicker than other remote systems; and task

Art Unit: 2452

assigning will be based on the track record. The claimed a response from a “first system to generate a response” is a response indicates that the remote system is capable of processing the task, having nothing to do with its processing performance on the task. On the other hand, the cited section recites performance record of the remote system, having nothing to do with a first system to response. In other words, the first system to generate a response may not be the quickest system to perform the task.

5. **35 USC 103 rejection**

6. For claim 1, applicant argues that Cajolet-Banz-ON does not teach assigning a task to a first system to respond. The examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Cajolet teaches that remote systems send response messages to a task indication message (fig. 6 step 104-106, assisting computers send back responses with computer characteristics that task can be done). Banz teaches a plurality of workstations so that task can be assigned to the first available workstation ([0021] lines 1-7, select a first available call taker workstation to assign the next call to). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Cajolet and Banz to assign task to a first available remote system of the plurality of systems having responded so that the system

Art Unit: 2452

corresponding to the first response message is to be assigned the task first as it is available.

Applicant argues that Banz's systems do not respond to a request. The examiner does not intend to explain responding to requests using Banz. On the other hand, Cajolet clearly teaches systems responding to requests as shown in the rejection. Banz's teachings is to assign task to the first available system. The combination of Banz and Cajolet would result in task assignment to the first system to respond or to be available. The argument regarding a first implying a second system is vague. Banz teaches a plurality of systems and tasks are assigned to a first available system; whereas Cajolet also discloses a plurality of systems responding to a task request.

The combination does not teach away from the claimed invention since there is no disclosure, teachings and/or suggestions in Banz that would enable one of ordinary skilled in the art to conclude that Banz avoids assigning task between multiple devices. Banz clearly teaches a plurality of systems for task resolving and tasks are assigned to a first available system; whereas Cajolet also discloses a plurality of systems responding to a task request. The combination does not teach away from the claimed invention since there is no disclosure, teachings and/or suggestions in Cajolet that would enable one of ordinary skilled in the art to conclude that Cajolet avoids assigning task to the first system to respond due to the same rationale above.

Applicant argues that assigning a task such as compilation task is not well known in the art. The examiner disagrees. Assigning a task to a first available

Art Unit: 2452

system was taught by Cajolet-Banz. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to apply type of tasks in this manner including compilation tasks, which is just an application of Cajolet-Banz to a particular type of tasking.

The citation of Official Notice is to notice the fact that first-in first-out queuing is extremely known in the art of networking. One skilled in the art can appreciate from the teachings of Cajolet-Banz that implementing a FIFO queue so that first received response message will be queued and the associated system with the first response will be assigned the task is a simple application of using a FIFO queue.

7. For claim 2, applicant argues that the prior art does not teach a router to distribute a task to a plurality of remote systems according to a distribution list. The examiner disagrees. The claimed router is no more than any router or routing module in a network located between the task dispatcher and the remote systems, for it simply forwards the task request message to a plurality of remote systems. It is known in the art of networking that any router on the transmission path between the task dispatcher and the remote systems, or it can be even the task dispatcher itself receiving the list and forwarding the requests according to the list. Harper discloses a gateway in between a task dispatcher and remote systems, capable of transferring information between the task dispatcher and the remote systems (fig. 2, a gateway connected to a dispatcher for transmitting information, gateway and dispatcher can be one entity). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet-Banz-ON and Harper to dispatch tasks to multiple servers or

Art Unit: 2452

assistant computers via a gateway or a router to implement a larger or a WAN distributed system or to provide more scalability and failover capability.

8. For claim 32, applicant argues that the prior art does not teach reserving takes places at the remote system. The examiner disagrees and submits to maintain previous ground of rejection. It is obvious that the remote computer must reserve its task processing resources in order to be able to process the task when it is assigned to the remote system. The examiner further cites Jones to indicate that resource reservation is known in the art. Furthermore, reciting reserving takes places at the remote system does not mean that the remote system itself initiates the reservation; it simply means that the resources at the remote system are reserved. The argument is therefore unpersuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, and as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claim discloses "the first remote

Art Unit: 2452

system to generate a response and the first remote system to have its response received". The examiner cannot find any disclosure in the specification regarding "the first remote system to generate a response" in the specification. Clearly a first remote system to generate a response can be different from a first remote system to have its response received by the client, implied in the claimed language and as known in the art due to inherent network delays of transferring the response to the client. There is no assigning task based on a first remote system to generate a response in the original disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 1, 3-7, 9-15, 17-19, 28, 29 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet (US 6,192,388), in view of Bantz et al. (US 2002/0169606, hereafter Bantz), further in view of what has been known in the art (Official Notice or ON)

13. For claim 1, Cajolet discloses a method, comprising:

indicating to two or more remote systems in a distributed data processing system that a task, in a task list, is available for processing based on a

Art Unit: 2452

distribution list (fig. 6 step 100, assisting computers receive request for assistance on task processing, col. 9 lines 63-64, fig. 7 item 136, list of assistant computers, col. 3 lines 17-21, task portion queue or list); wherein an indication specifies at least one resource requirement (col. 8 lines 24-36, a job servicing request has indication of software required to do the job)

receiving at least one response from at least two of the two or more remote systems capable of performing the task responsive to receiving the indication (fig. 6 step 104-106, assisting computers send back response with computer characteristics that task can be done);

wherein the at least one response is based on a determination by the two or more remote systems that the at least one resource requirement is satisfied (col. 8 lines 24-36, checking whether the computer that received the request can satisfy the request's requirement such as software needed)

assigning the task from the task list to a remote system to respond based on a selection of a remote system that responds (fig. 6 steps 110-112, col. 2 line 63-col. 3 line 11, assigning task to assisting computers participate in distributed task processing, col. 8 lines 43-53, dispatcher receiving responses from assisting computers and selecting one to assign the task to).

Cajolet does not explicitly disclose the selection is selecting a remote system that responds first or be available first.

However, Bantz discloses assigning task to a first available system ([0021] lines 1-7, [0022], select a first available call taker workstation to assign the next call to)

Art Unit: 2452

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Cajolet and Bantz to assign task to a first available remote system or the first remote system to respond so that tasks can be assigned as soon as systems are available (Bantz, [0021]).

Cajolet-Bantz does not disclose the task is a compilation task.

However, Official Notice is taken that distributing compilation tasks is known at the time of the invention (see e.g., Sundararajan et al., US 6,487,577, abstract).

Also Official Notice is taken that queuing techniques such as First In First Out (FIFO) is known in the art, meaning assigning tasks in a first in first out manner such that first arrival response will be assigned task to is well known.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet, Bantz and what has been known in the art to assign compilation tasks to the first available workstation or assisting computer to implement a basic workload algorithm (Bantz, [0021]).

14. For claim 3, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses indicating to the one or more remote systems comprises indicating a threshold criterion that the one or more remote systems should satisfy, and wherein receiving the at least one response comprises receiving the at least one response from the one or more remote systems that satisfy the threshold criterion (Cajolet, fig. 8, col. 11 lines 11-60, thresholds that assistant processing computers have to pass in order to satisfy the requirement of the tasks).

15. For claim 4, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses indicating the threshold criterion comprises indicating at least one of a preselected processing speed, memory size, and network speed for the one or more remote systems (Cajolet, fig. 8, col. 11 lines 11-60).

16. For claim 5, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses receiving the at least one response comprises receiving configuration information associated with the one or more remote systems (Cajolet, col. 8 lines 38-40, sending configuration to task dispatcher); and wherein the first remote system to respond refers to at least one of a first remote system to generate a response and a first remote system to have its response received (Cajolet, col. 8 lines 43-52, responses received from remote systems at a problem dispatcher, Bantz, [0021], selection of the first available system to assign task to)

17. For claim 6, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses receiving the configuration information comprises receiving information including at least one of a processing speed, memory size, network speed, and load level associated with the one or more remote systems (Cajolet, fig. 8, col. 11 lines 11-60).

18. For claim 7, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses allowing at least one of the one or more remote systems to perform the task comprises allowing at least one of the one or more remote systems to perform the task based on a selection

Art Unit: 2452

scheme (Cajolet, col. 8 lines 43-53, selection of assistant computers), wherein the selection scheme comprises at least one of allowing a remote system that responds first to perform the task (Bantz, select a first available call taker workstation to process the next call) and allowing a remote system to perform the compilation task based on the received configuration information (Cajolet, col. 8 lines 39-53, selection of assistant computer based on its configuration).

19. For claim 9, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the act of indicating comprises indicating that the compilation task is available for processing (Cajolet, fig. 6 steps 100-102, receive request for processing of an available task), and wherein the act of receiving comprises receiving the at least one response from a remote system that has reserved at least a portion of its resources for performing the task (Cajolet, fig. 8 available resources at the assistant computers).

20. For claim 10, Cajolet discloses an article comprising one or more machine-readable storage media containing instructions that when executed enable a processor to:

indicate to a plurality of remote systems in a distributed data processing system that a task in a task list is available for processing based on a list identifying the remote systems (fig. 6 step 100, assisting computers receive request for assistance on task processing, col. 9 lines 63-64, list of assistant computers, col. 3 lines 17-21, task portion queue or list); wherein the indication

Art Unit: 2452

specifies at least one resource requirement (col. 8 lines 24-36, a job servicing request has indication of software required to do the job)

assign the task from the task list to a remote system of the one or more remote systems to respond based on a selection of a remote system that responds (fig. 6 steps 110-112, col. 2 line 63-col. 3 line 11, assigning task to assisting computers participate in distributed task processing; col. 8 lines 43-53, dispatcher receiving responses from assisting computers and selecting one to assign the task to); wherein assigning is based on a determination by the one or more remote systems that the at least one resource requirement is satisfied (col. 8 lines 24-36, checking whether the computer that received the request can satisfy the request's requirement such as software needed)

Cajolet does not explicitly disclose the selection is selecting a first remote system to respond or be available.

However, Bantz discloses assigning task to a first available system ([0021] lines 1-7, [0022], select a first available call taker workstation to assign the next call to)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Cajolet and Bantz to assign task to a first available remote system or the first remote system to respond so that tasks can be assigned as soon as systems are available (Bantz, [0021]).

Cajolet-Bantz does not disclose the task is a compilation task.

However, Official Notice is taken that distributing compilation tasks is known at the time of the invention (see e.g., Sundararajan et al., US 6,487,577,

Art Unit: 2452

abstract). Also Official Notice is taken that queuing techniques such as First In First Out (FIFO) is known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet, Bantz and what has been known in the art to assign compilation tasks to the first available workstation or assisting computer to implement a basic workload algorithm (Bantz, [0021]) by assigning task to a first available remote system so that the system corresponding to first response message (or the first available system) is to be assigned the task first.

21. For claim 11, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the task is a compilation task (Cajolet, col. 9 lines 6-9, a rendering task composing of many task portions) and wherein the instructions when executed enable the processor to allow at least one of the plurality of remote systems based on a selection scheme (Cajolet, col. 8 lines 43-53).

22. For claim 12, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to allow that remote system which responds first to perform the task (Bantz, [0021] lines 1-7, select a first available call taker workstation to process the next call).

23. For claim 13, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to allow the remote system having at least one of

Art Unit: 2452

a higher processing speed among the plurality of responding remote systems to perform the task (Cajolet, fig. 7 steps 130, 132) and a desirable performance characteristic, wherein the performance characteristic is determined based on past performance (Cajolet, col. 11 lines 20-60, past performance).

24. For claim 14, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to allow a plurality of remote systems to perform the task in response to determining that a number of responding remote systems exceed a number of available tasks (Cajolet, col. 9 lines 5-15, a plurality of assistant computers to process portions of a same task).

25. For claim 15, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to receive responses from at least one of the plurality of the remote systems, wherein the response includes configuration information associated with the one or more remote systems (Cajolet, col. 8 lines 38-42, responses with computer characteristics).

26. For claim 17, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to receive results from the at least one remote system that is allowed to perform the task (Cajolet, fig. 5, send render task and receive finished render task).

27. For claim 18, Cajolet discloses an apparatus, comprising:

means for indicating to one or more remote systems in a distributed data processing system that a task in a task list is available for processing based on a distribution list identifying the one or more remote systems (fig. 6 step 100, assisting computers receive request for assistance on task processing, col. 9 lines 63-64, list of assistant computers, col. 3 lines 17-21, task portion queue or list); and wherein the means for indicating specifies at least one resource requirement (col. 8 lines 24-36, a job servicing request has indication of software required to do the job)

means for receiving at least one response from the one or more remote systems capable of performing the task based on the indication (fig. 6 step 104-106, assisting computers send back response with computer characteristics that task can be done); wherein the at least one response is based on a determination by the one or more remote systems that the at least one resource requirement is satisfied (col. 8 lines 24-36, checking whether the computer that received the request can satisfy the request's requirement such as software needed); and

means for assigning the task from the task list to a remote system of the one or more remote systems to respond based on a selection of a remote system that responds (fig. 6 steps 110-112, col. 2 line 63-col. 3 line 11, assigning task to assisting computers participate in distributed task processing; col. 8 lines 43-53, dispatcher receiving responses from assisting computers and selecting one to assign the task to)

Cajolet does not explicitly disclose the selection is selecting a first remote system to respond or be available.

However, Bantz discloses assigning task to a first available system ([0021] lines 1-7, [0022], select a first available call taker workstation to assign the next call to)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Cajolet and Bantz to assign task to a first available remote system or the first remote system to respond so that tasks can be assigned as soon as systems are available (Bantz, [0021]).

Cajolet-Bantz does not disclose a distributed data processing compilation system.

However, Official Notice is taken that distributing compilation tasks is known at the time of the invention (see e.g., Sundararajan et al., US 6,487,577, abstract). Also Official Notice is taken that queuing techniques such as First In First Out (FIFO) is known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet, Bantz and what has been known in the art to assign compilation tasks to the first available workstation or assisting computer to implement a basic workload algorithm (Bantz, [0021]) by assigning task to a first available remote system so that the system corresponding to first response message (or the first available system) is to be assigned the task first.

Art Unit: 2452

28. For claim 19, Cajolet discloses an apparatus, comprising:

an interface adapted to communicate with one or more remote systems;

and

a control unit communicatively coupled to the interface, the control unit adapted to:

indicate to the one or more remote systems in a distributed data processing system that a task in a task list is available for processing based on a distribution list identifying the one or more remote systems (fig. 6 step 100, assisting computers receive request for assistance on task processing, col. 9 lines 63-64, list of assistant computers, col. 3 lines 17-21, task portion queue or list); and wherein the indication specifies at least one resource requirement (col. 8 lines 24-36, a job servicing request has indication of software required to do the job)

receive at least one response from the one or more remote systems capable of performing the task based on the indication (fig. 6 step 104-106, assisting computers send back response with computer characteristics that task can be done); wherein the at least one response is based on a determination by the one or more remote systems that the at least one resource requirement is satisfied (col. 8 lines 24-36, checking whether the computer that received the request can satisfy the request's requirement such as software needed); and

assign the task from the task list to a remote system of the one or more remote systems to respond based on a selection of a remote system that responds (fig. 6 steps 110-112, col. 2 line 63-col. 3 line 11, assigning task to

Art Unit: 2452

assisting computers participate in distributed task processing; col. 8 lines 43-53, dispatcher receiving responses from assisting computers and selecting one to assign the task to)

Cajolet does not explicitly disclose the selection is selecting a first remote system to respond or be available.

However, Bantz discloses assigning task to a first available system ([0021] lines 1-7, [0022], select a first available call taker workstation to assign the next call to)

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of Cajolet and Bantz to assign task to a first available remote system or the first remote system to respond so that tasks can be assigned as soon as systems are available (Bantz, [0021]).

Cajolet-Bantz does not disclose a distributed data processing compilation system.

However, Official Notice is taken that distributing compilation tasks is known at the time of the invention (see e.g., Sundararajan et al., US 6,487,577, abstract)

Also Official Notice is taken that queuing techniques such as First In First Out (FIFO) is known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet, Bantz and what has been known in the art to assign compilation tasks to the first available workstation or assisting computer to implement a basic workload algorithm (Bantz, [0021]), by

Art Unit: 2452

assigning task to a first available remote system so that the system corresponding to first response message (or the first available system) is to be assigned the task first.

29. For claim 28, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the control unit is adapted to identify the task that is available for processing in a queue that is accessible by one or more of the remote systems (Cajolet, fig. 7 steps 146-148, continuing to new task portion in a queue).

30. For claim 29, the claim is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 19.

31. For claim 31, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses at least one of the one or more remote systems is adapted to: detect an indication from the client system that a compilation task is available for processing (Cajolet, fig. 6 step 100, assisting computers receive request for assistance on task processing); determine if the at least one remote system is capable of processing the compilation task (Cajolet, fig. 6 step 104-106, assisting computers send back response with computer characteristics that task can be done); and process the compilation task for the client system in response to determining that at least one remote system is capable of processing the compilation task (Cajolet, fig. 6 steps 110-112, assisting computers participate in distributed task processing).

Art Unit: 2452

32. Claims 35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet in view of Bantz.

33. For claim 35, Cajolet discloses a method, comprising:

indicating to one or more remote systems in a distributed data processing system that a task in a task list is available for processing (fig. 6 step 100, assisting computers receive request for assistance on task processing, col. 3 lines 17-21, task portion queue or list); and wherein the indication specifies at least one resource requirement (col. 8 lines 24-36, a job servicing request has indication of software required to do the job)

receiving at least one response from the one or more remote systems capable of performing the task responsive to receiving the indication (fig. 6 step 104-106, assisting computers send back response with computer characteristics that task can be done); wherein the at least one response is based on a determination by the one or more remote systems that the at least one resource requirement is satisfied (col. 8 lines 24-36, checking whether the computer that received the request can satisfy the request's requirement such as software needed); and

assigning the task from the task list to a remote system of the one or more remote systems to respond based on a selection of a remote system that responds (fig. 6 steps 110-112, col. 2 line 63-col. 3 line 11, assigning task to assisting computers participate in distributed task processing; col. 8 lines 43-53,

Art Unit: 2452

dispatcher receiving responses from assisting computers and selecting one to assign the task to)

Cajolet does not explicitly disclose the selection is selecting a first remote system to respond or be available.

However, Bantz discloses assigning task to a first available systems ([0021] lines 1-7, [0022], select a first available call taker workstation to assign the next call to)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet, Bantz to assign tasks to the first available workstation or assisting computer to implement a basic workload algorithm (Bantz, [0021]), by assigning task to a first available remote system so that the system corresponding to first response message (or the first available system) is to be assigned the task first.

34. For claim 37, Cajolet-Bantz further discloses the task is at least one of a compilation task, a video processing task, audio processing task, image processing task, encryption task, and decryption task (Cajolet, fig. 5, 3D image rendering task)

35. Claims 16, 30 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet-Bantz, in view of what has been known in the art, and in view of Hinni et al. (US 2007/0011226, hereafter Hinni)

36. For claim 36, Cajolet-Bantz further discloses the distributed system is a distributed system, and wherein indicating comprises indicating to the one or more remote systems that a task is available for processing (fig. 6 step 100, assisting computers receive request for assistance on task processing); wherein the indication was based on a distribution list identifying the one or more remote systems (fig. 7, 136, list of assistants), and further wherein receiving the at least one response comprises receiving the at least one response from the one or more remote systems capable of performing the task responsive to receiving the indication (fig. 6 step 104-106, assisting computers send back response with computer characteristics that task can be done)

Cajolet-Bantz does not disclose a distributed compilation system with compilation tasks.

However, Official Notice is taken that distributing compilation tasks is known at the time of the invention (see e.g., Sundararajan et al., US 6,487,577, abstract)

Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the client transmitting task request to a plurality remote computers (Cajolet, fig. 7 steps 123, 126). Cajolet-Bantz-ON does not explicitly disclose the request from the client system was a multicast request.

However, Hinni discloses the same ([0079] lines 3-5, multicast task request to multiple task handlers)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet-Bantz and ON and Hinni to

Art Unit: 2452

multicast task request to a plurality of computers since multicasting is an efficient method of transmitting same information to multiple receivers (as compared to, e.g., unicasting).

37. Claims 16 and 30 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 36.

38. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet-Bantz-ON as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Harper et al. (US 2002/0087612, hereafter Harper).

39. For claim 2, Cajolet-Bantz-ON further discloses the distribution list comprises destination addresses associated with the one or more remote systems (Cajolet, col. 9 lines 63-64, list of assistant computers, obviously containing their addresses), and transmitting transmits at least a portion of the message to a plurality of the remote systems based on the distribution list (Cajolet, col. 6 l. 41-47, transmitting requests to assist in processing tasks to multiple computers)

Cajolet-Bantz-ON does not explicitly disclose providing a message to a router that, responsive to the message, transmits at least a portion of the message to a plurality of the remote systems based on the distribution list.

However, Harper discloses a gateway in between a task dispatcher and remote systems, capable of transferring information between the task dispatcher

Art Unit: 2452

and the remote systems (fig. 2, a gateway connected to a dispatcher for transmitting information, gateway and dispatcher can be one entity)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet-Bantz-ON and Harper to dispatch tasks to multiple servers or assistant computers via a gateway or a router to implement a larger or a WAN distributed system or to provide more scalability and failover capability.

40. Claims 8 and 20-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet-Bantz-ON as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Harper and Hinni.

41. For claim 8, Cajolet-Bantz-ON does not explicitly disclose wherein indicating to the one or more remote systems comprises providing a message to a router that, responsive to the message, transmits, at least a portion of the message to a plurality of the remote systems based on the distribution list;

However, Harper discloses the same (fig. 2, a gateway connected to a dispatcher for transmitting task advertisements)

Cajolet-Bantz-ON-Harper does not disclose wherein the distribution list is a multicast list, and transmitting is via multicast.

However, Hinni discloses the same ([0079] lines 3-5, multicast task request to multiple task handlers)

Art Unit: 2452

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet-Bantz-ON, Harper and Hinni to multicast task request to a plurality of computers since multicasting is an efficient method of transmitting same information to multiple receivers (as compared to, e.g., unicasting).

42. Claim 20 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 8.

43. For claim 21, Cajolet-Bantz-ON-Harper-Hinni further discloses the control unit is adapted to indicate a threshold criterion that the one or more remote systems should satisfy and further adapted to receive the at least one response from the one or more remote systems that satisfy the threshold criterion (Cajolet, fig. 8, col. 11 lines 11-60, thresholds that assistant processing computers have to pass in order to satisfy the requirement of the tasks).

44. For claim 22, Cajolet-Bantz-ON-Harper-Hinni further discloses the control unit is adapted to indicate at least one of a minimum processing speed, memory amount, and network speed for the one or more remote systems (Cajolet, fig. 8, col. 11 lines 11-60).

45. For claim 23, Cajolet-Bantz-ON-Harper-Hinni further discloses the control unit is adapted to receive configuration information associated with the one or

Art Unit: 2452

more remote systems (Cajolet, col. 8 lines 38-40, sending configuration to task dispatcher).

46. For claim 24, Cajolet-Bantz-ON-Harper-Hinni further discloses the control unit is adapted to receive information including at least one of a processing speed, memory size, network speed, and load level associated with the one or more remote systems (Cajolet, fig. 8, col. 11 lines 11-60).

47. For claim 25, Cajolet-Bantz-ON-Harper-Hinni further discloses allowing at least one of the remote systems to perform the task comprises allowing the one or more remote systems to perform the task based on a selection scheme (Cajolet, col. 8 lines 43-53, selection of assistant computers).

48. For claim 26, Cajolet-Bantz-ON-Harper-Hinni further discloses the instructions when executed enable the processor to allow that remote system which responds first to perform the task (Bantz, [0021] lines 1-7, select a first available call taker workstation to process the next call).

49. For claim 27, Cajolet-Bantz-ON-Harper-Hinni further discloses the selection scheme comprises allowing a remote system to perform the compilation task based on the received configuration information (Cajolet, fig. 6 steps 110-112, assisting computers participate in distributed task processing).

Art Unit: 2452

50. Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cajolet in view of Jones et al. (US 2002/0007389, hereafter Jones), further in view of what has been known in the art (ON).

51. For claim 32, Cajolet discloses a method, comprising:

detecting an indication from a client system to process one or more tasks (fig. 6 step 100, assisting computers receive request for assistance on task processing);

determining if a remote system that detects the indication is capable of processing at least one of the one or more tasks in response to detecting the indication from the client system (fig. 6 step 104-106, assisting computers send back response with computer characteristics that task can be done); and

processing the at least one task for the client system in response to at least one or more of the tasks from the client system being assigned to first remote system (fig. 6 steps 110-112, assisting computers participate in distributed task processing, assigning task to the best computer based on a formula).

Cajolet does not explicitly disclose reserving one or more resources of the remote system in response to determining that the remote system is capable of processing the at least one of the one or more compilation tasks; wherein the reserving takes place at the remote system.

However, Jones discloses reserving a resource after determining amount of resource needed for a requested task (abstract, fig. 2, items 34-36), wherein

Art Unit: 2452

resources is reserved at the remote systems ([0012], local resource planner reserves resource of the distributed computer systems)

Cajolet-Jones does not disclose a distributed compilation system with compilation tasks.

However, Official Notice is taken that distributing compilation tasks is known at the time of the invention (see e.g., Sundararajan et al., US 6,487,577, abstract)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Cajolet and Jones and what has been known to reserve resource in response to determining that the remote system is capable of processing the at least one of the compilation task in order to make the resource of an assisting computer available when needed and therefore make distributed program running on multiple machines exhibit predictable behavior (Jones, abstract).

52. For claim 33, Cajolet-Jones-ON further discloses providing results of the processing to the client system (Cajolet, fig. 5, send render task and receive finished render task).

53. For claim 34, Cajolet-Jones-ON further discloses the processing comprises accessing a queue associated with the client system and determining the compilation task to process (Cajolet, fig. 7 steps 146-148, continuing to new task portion in a queue).

Conclusion

54. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn. The last office action is a non-final office action.

55. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

56. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The

Art Unit: 2452

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HH

/Kenny S Lin/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452